VOLUME VIII APRIL, 1922 NUMBER 4

BULLETIN

OF

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

ENCOURAGEMENT OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH

PUBLISHED BY
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
225 CHURCH STREET, EASTON, PA.
EDITORIAL OFFICE: 222 CHARLES RIVER ROAD
CAMBRIDGE
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
General Announcements	
Annual Meeting	3
American Council on Education	3
American University Union in Europe	3
Association of American Colleges: College Athletics	4
Carnegie Foundation Annual Report	5
College Entrance Examination Board	9
U. S. Bureau of Education	10
Proposed Legislation Against the Teaching of Evolution	11
Recent Educational Discussion	
Department of Superintendence at Chicago	18
A National Policy on Engineering Education	20
Subsidies for Attendance at Society Meetings	22
A Brief for Latin as the Universal Language	25
Encouragement of University Research	
Report of Committee R	27
Graduate Students and Faculty Research, *Woodbridge*	40
Local and Chapter Notes	
Colorado: An Experiment in Faculty Participation	41
Vassar: Tenure of Office	42
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	42
Purdue University	42
Membership	
Members Elected	44
Nominations	44

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

ANNUAL MEETING.—The next annual meeting will be held in December at New Haven, Connecticut, in connection with those of the American Historical Association, the American Philological Association and the Archeological Institute of America. It is hoped that arrangements may be worked out for a joint program for at least one session. Our own program is likely to connect itself largely with the work of the Committees on Intellectual Interests and Standards of Undergraduates and on Promotion of Research.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION.—At a recent meeting of the Executive Committee of the American Council on Education it was voted, after discussion of proposals made by this Association at the last annual meeting (see pages 3 and 4 of the February BULLETIN):

To approve the establishment by the Council's office of a register of college and university professors and instructors. The Director was instructed to bring before the Committee at its next meeting forms for registration and a general plan for the conduct of such a service. It was further voted that a statement should be issued to the academic profession emphasizing the professional importance of a complete record of holders of collegiate and university posts and requesting individual registrations at a fee sufficient to cover the cost of clerical service.

To request the Chairman and the Director to appoint a committee of the Council to investigate the present status of discussion and agreements with respect to academic freedom and tenure with a view to recommending helpful action that might be taken by the Council.

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY UNION IN EUROPE.—Dr. Paul van Dyke, Professor of Modern History at Princeton University, and now on leave of absence as Director of the Continental Division of the American University Union at 1 Rue de Fleurus, Paris, has accepted the invitation of the Trustees of the Union to retain the Directorship for 1922–23.

Dr. Horatio S. Krans, Secretary and Assistant Director of the Continental Division, also retains his position for another year. He has held his present office since the war, thus securing a continuity of administration which has contributed very considerably to the success of the undertaking.

The Rector of the University of Paris, at the suggestion of the officers of the Continental Division of the Union, has agreed to the appointment of advisers to American students in Paris. Three members of the Faculties of Letters, of Law (which includes Political Science) and of Science respectively have already been appointed. All of them have visited the United States, speak English, and are especially interested in American students, so that their advice and help will be of great service. The appointment of a similar adviser in the Faculty of Medicine is under consideration.

THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES at its Annual Meeting, January 12–14, adopted the following resolutions on College Athletics:

"This Association desires to put on record its disapproval of the evident tendency to over-emphasize the spectacular features of intercollegiate athletic sports.

"We approve of athletics in the college. We should give them more support and encouragement, not less. But our effort should be directed to the building up of the health and physical wellbeing of all of our students and not directed primarily to the development of a few highly specialized athletes or to the winning of games. The intense rivalries and the excessive demands of the public have laid upon the colleges a strain to which they ought not to be subjected. The temptation to increase prestige by gaining athletic victories has resulted in some instances in the sacrificing of our ideals and in the lowering of the tone of intercollegiate contests.

"Whether there is less of the professional spirit or more than has obtained in the past is perhaps a matter of debate—the important thing to register is that there is too much.

"We consider it our bounden duty to see that there shall not be the least suspicion of professionalism or commercialism in our college athletics. To the end that we may put an end to certain conditions and practices that are at present a menace to the amateur spirit in college athletics, RESOLVED

1. That we urge upon the colleges and universities of this Association a closer supervision and a stricter vigilance in excluding from their athletics every practice that has in it the least taint of the professional spirit, and so to organize their athletics that the physical well-being of all the students may be secured. Specifically we recommend the general adoption by the members of this Association of the one year freshman rule and the rule known as the migratory rule.

2. That this Association request the Carnegie Foundation to provide a survey of the athletic situation in our colleges in the hope that a way may be found and a general plan adopted by which clean athletics may be provided for all, and at the same time preserving the generous rivalries and enthusiasms of intercollegiate contests without undue sacrifice of energies and with no sacrifice of ideals."

The following Officers were elected:

President, C. A. Richmond, Union College; Vice-President, Samuel Plantz, Lawrence College; Executive Secretary, Dr. Robert L. Kelly; Secretary-Treasurer, Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College.

Among the Committees are:

Committee on Faculty and Student Scholarship:

F. C. Ferry, Hamilton College; E. E. Brown, New York University; F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University; Samuel Plantz, Lawrence College; Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College; J. H. MacCracken, Lafayette College.

Sabbatical Leave:

O. E. Randall, Brown University; H. N. MacCracken, Vassar College; W. D. Scott, Northwestern University; C. A. Richmond, Union College; J. S. Nollen, Grinnell College.

Academic Freedom:

C. N. Cole, Oberlin College; J. W. Mauck, Hillsdale College; R. C. Flickinger, Northwestern University; H. M. Gage, Coe College; W. J. Hutchins, Berea College.

CARNEGIE FOUNDATION ANNUAL REPORT.—The sixteenth annual report of the President and Treasurer contains the usual statistical details, showing 609 allowances now in force, aggregating approximately $960,000; 98 of the allowances, aggregating approximately $110,000, are for persons connected with institutions not on the associated list. The total cost of retiring allowances and pensions to date is approximately $8,900,000, the largest aggregate for any single institution being $705,000 in the case of Harvard University.

During the year it has been decided that teachers in associated institutions who were ineligible under the free pension plan, but who become contributors under the contractual plan, should have all the advantages of disability and guaranteed interest that are provided by the Foundation, but that officers or teachers primarily engaged in university extension work are not eligible.

The Executive Committee has adhered to its previous decision that the withdrawal of a teacher from the list of associated institutions, at any time after November 7, 1915, terminated his prospects

of a retiring allowance from the Foundation, even though he should later return to an associated institution, and that teachers were not eligible if they received an income from work other than teaching which was larger than that received from teaching. It also repeated the ruling that service as tutor could not count toward a retiring allowance.

Four institutions have been added to the associated list: Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Virginia; Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa; Converse College, Spartanburg, South Carolina and Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee.

Details are given in regard to the conditions under which the following twenty-one institutions have adopted the contributory system: Acadia University, Antioch College, University of Alabama, Bates College, University of Cincinnati, Clark University, Converse College, Cornell College (Iowa), University of Dubuque, Fisk University, Lehigh University, Stanford University, Marietta College, Meadville Theological School, Mount Holyoke College, Ohio Wesleyan University, Rollins College, Smith College, Washington and Lee University, Wesleyan University and Winthrop College. Participation by teachers is explicitly required in the case of Clark University, Fisk University and Wesleyan University.

There is an extended review of recent changes in college entrance requirements from which the following is quoted:

"There was no change between 1912 and 1920 in the relative order of the four subjects most frequently prescribed, namely English, Mathematics, Latin, and the History, Civics, Economics group; they represented 90 per cent of the prescriptions in 1912 and 94 per cent in 1920. Nor was there change in the fifth, sixth, and seventh places, occupied by General Science, Greek, and Physics, both in 1912 and 1920. German was more frequently prescribed than French in 1912, but vanished as a prescription in 1920. Chemistry had the smallest number of units of the ten subjects prescribed in 1912 and of the nine prescribed in 1920, but it was the only subject in which the number of prescribed units increased.

"Taking alternates and electives together, the most frequent subjects were Latin, German, and French, in 1912, and German, French, and Latin, in 1920; then Greek, Mathematics, the History group, English, and Spanish, in 1912, as compared with Spanish, History, etc., Greek, and Mathematics, in 1920. English dropped from

seventh to fifteenth place, Physics and Chemistry moved from ninth and tenth to eighth and ninth.

"In alternates and electives combined, only three subjects Spanish, General Science, and Business—increased. All of the other decreased. In alternates and electives, English and Mathematics lost the most in 1920, they only losing more than half. Physics and Chemistry each decreased one-fourth; French and German decreased the least, about one-fifth.

"In summarizing the relative frequency of the various subjects in prescriptions, alternates and electives, all together, a ratio of evaluation has been taken; namely, one, one-fourth, and one-eighth, respectively—the average alternate group containing four subjects, the average elective group eight. The most frequent subjects were thus: English, Mathematics, and Latin; the History, Civics, and Economics group; German and French, both in 1912 and 1920. The seventh, eighth and ninth subjects were Greek, Spanish, General Science in 1912, and Spanish, General Science, and Greek in 1920. The next four subjects, Physics, Chemistry, Business, and Botany, retained their order. In the final group, consisting of Zoology, Physiography, and Drawing, in 1912, Physiography took first place in 1920. The continued predominance of the Classics and other traditional subjects is evident, as is the continuance in frequency of German over French. The small attention given to science and to the vocational subjects, Business and Drawing, are even more striking.

"Among electives, Foreign Languages are everywhere first and Science everywhere second, except in the State Universities, where it is third. They give second place to History, which is elsewhere third. Mathematics is everywhere fourth, and English everywhere fifth.

"Among the foreign languages, Latin is everywhere the favorite, German is still next in popularity; French next, quite closely; Greek next; and Spanish last.

The report also discusses provision for the training of teachers, as well as medical and legal education.

"A conspicuous recent change has involved the elimination in several states of the traditional and somewhat anomalous term 'normal school' and the formal substitution of the more appropriate title 'teachers college.' Only one (Rhode Island) appears to have

been attracted by the still better name, 'college of education,' in spite of its better form as well as its natural parallels in other types of professional training such as medicine, law, and engineering. The teacher would be the gainer by a co-ordination of this sort in the case of junior and undergraduate professional training, just as 'schools of education' conforms to the accepted terminology for senior and graduate organizations.

"California, Illinois, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma and Rhode Island have thus rechristened their training institutions, usually granting them the right, if not already enjoyed, of conferring degrees. Massachusetts has bestowed the latter right upon its normal schools without altering their name.

"Granted the power to survey the question of good teachers apart from the fortunes of this or that institution, the same efficient arrangement could easily be contrived between state colleges of education and a state university, or between one or more state colleges of education and others. Some form of intelligent, centralized control is probably necessary to bring this about, but it commends itself as a saner, more economical arrangement than to permit a group of schools whose number is determined by local needs of the lowest grade, to struggle blindly with fate and with each other to take on at once the proportions of institutions that serve quite different ends.

"Another movement of an almost opposite character has shown signs of extension that are disquieting. This is the attempt to combine with established teacher training institutions the first two years of a college of liberal arts—the so-called 'junior college' curriculum. The wish to be known as a degree-granting teachers college, even of dwarfish disproportions, shows at least a desire to serve the professional purpose; but to conduct adequately the first half of a liberal arts college course in the close institutional intimacy with a two-year teacher-preparatory curriculum that this arrangement necessitates, seems bound to cripple the professional procedure and purpose in a very serious manner.

"There is no intention in what is said here of disparaging the junior college movement either as an outgrowth of municipal secondary education or as found in separate institutions; it is intended to urge emphatically what experience has made clear beyond question, namely, that a sound school for teachers must have its own exclusive

curricula and student body, its own staff of teachers, its own buildings and equipment, and its own independent budget and administration for the reasons that hold good of every other form of advanced professional training."

A list is given of 147 residential law schools conferring degrees.

The report proper closes with an extended review of pension systems and pension legislation.

COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD.—The annual report of the Secretary, a pamphlet of more than 130 pages, deals primarily with the examinations of June, 1921, but contains an interesting discussion of examinations as measures and of fluctuations in results of examinations.

"At written examinations such as those held by the Board what are the factors that determine the results for a given candidate? Should these factors be separated; or may they be discussed in a satisfactory manner while in combination with each other? Can they be expressed quantitatively in terms of units defined with the same regard to rigorous thinking that one demands in the exact sciences?

"Factors that come immediately into mind are the following:

(1) The candidate's previous effort or exertion to master the subject matter as presented to him by his teacher.

(2) The adequacy of the textbooks studied by the candidate and the competence of his teacher.

(3) The candidate's memory.

(4) The candidate's logical power or ability to reason.

(5) The candidate's constructive or creative power, depending chiefly upon his imagination and intuition.

(6) The candidate's power of expression, depending largely upon his skill in the use of good English.

(7) The candidate's power of concentration, exhibited in part by his composure amid unusual and disturbing conditions.

(8) The candidate's intellectual alertness.

(9) The candidate's facility in writing rapidly and in arranging his work neatly, depending to some extent upon experience acquired at previous examinations.

"Without question it would be very difficult year after year to produce examination papers for which these factors would be invariable," says the report. "It is hardly conceivable that successive committees of examiners in a given subject would attach the same relative importance to memory, ability to reason, originality, power of expression, and skill in planning one's work."

This year, as an experiment, the Secretary has been asked by the Board to report not only percentages assigned by the readers, but also the grades of the candidates according to percentiles. The Board has appointed commissions on the revision of the definition of the requirements in mathematics, on the revision of the requirement in history with a view to its radical simplification, on the feasibility of conducting oral examinations in the modern languages and a commission to investigate and report on general intelligence examinations and other new types of examination offered in secondary school subjects.

The Board examined in 1921 more than 18,000 candidates, of whom nearly one-half came from schools in New England, and more than 11,000 were seeking admission to colleges in New England; 2,713 of the candidates were seeking admission under the so-called New Plan.

THE U. S. BUREAU OF EDUCATION BULLETIN, 1921, No. 8—reviews foreign criticism of American education under the heads of American Educational Philosophy, The American School System, The Teacher, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Universities and Colleges, and Education as a Means of Control. A five page bibliography follows.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION AGAINST THE TEACHING OF EVOLUTION

In Kentucky[1]

"The Kentucky House of Representatives spent five hours today (March 9) in discussing and hearing discussions on the 'monkey bill' of Representative G. W. Ellis of Barren County, forbidding the teaching of evolution in public schools and universities. The measure was defeated by a vote of 42 to 41, after a recapitulation of the vote during which members were dragged into the chamber from other parts of the capital.

"Dr. F. L. McVey, president of the state university, and the Rev. Dr. E. L. Powell, pastor of the First Christian Church, Louisville, discussed the bill by invitation. The former declared that the legislature is not within its rights in passing such a law as that proposed, and urged the members not to base the inspiration of the Bible on matters not essential, but to heed teachings of the Book. He asserted that the Bible is not an authority on science, legislation, chemistry, or any of one thousand other subjects, but on moral, spiritual and religious matters. Dr. McVey went into the subject of evolution, pointing out that many accept the teachings as not in contradiction to the Bible, and insisted that the university makes no attempt to interfere with the religion of its students. He told of the various religious activities of the university, and warned the House that it would set a dangerous precedent in the passage of the Ellis bill. He recalled fights on scientific theories in the past based on the ground that they are opposing the Bible, and reviewed briefly the manner in which various scientific subjects are taught.

"Mr. Noel W. Gaines of Frankfort, formerly an army officer, . . . put William Jennings Bryan to shame in his denunciation of those who believe evolution, directing many of his remarks directly at Dr. Powell and Mr. McVey. . . . One of his 'stunts' was a division of the sheep and goats placing Dr. McVey, Dr. Powell and various zoology textbooks on the one side and the Bible, the Declaration of Independence and himself on the other. He had the books before him as he ran up and down behind the clerk's desk, scattering them

[1] Abridged from the *Louisville Courier-Journal.*

about as he waved his arms in emphatic gestures. Finally he threw one of the textbooks to the floor and trampled it under foot.

"'I am ashamed of this day in the Kentucky legislature,' said Representative G. C. Waggoner of Scott County, a minister and veteran legislator, toward the close of the debate.

"'This bill smacks of intolerance and the shadows of the Dark Ages are settling about us.' Mr. Waggoner opposed the bill on the ground that in passing it the legislature would exceed its functions as a law-making body and would set a dangerous precedent. 'There have been times here today when those on both sides of this discussion were about ready to place their opponents on the rack and torture them,' continued Mr. Waggoner. 'I don't know anything about evolution and from what I've heard I don't believe there are others here who do. We have set up a straw man and have been boxing industriously at him all day.' . . .

"When the roll was called the vote stood 38 to 36 for the bill, which meant its defeat, as 40 votes are required for passage. As Mr. Meyers was about to announce this the proponents demanded that the absentees be called. Then the vote was 40 to 39 for the bill. The opponents demanded a recapitulation. During that they dragged in two more members and the proponents one, making it 41 to 41. Representative Bryce Cundiff, who had declined to vote on the ground that he 'was a hard shell Baptist and believes what was would be anyhow,' said he would have to discard his religion and vote 'No.' Then the bill was declared to be defeated by a vote of 41 to 40.

In South Carolina[1]

"The teaching of 'the cult known as Darwinsim' as 'a creed to be followed' is prohibited in all state supported public schools and institutions of higher learning by a proviso attached as a rider to the general appropriation bill by the Senate yesterday morning. The amendment, which was tagged on to the end of the section providing for the appropriation of funds for the public school system, would make it impossible for any public school or higher institution of learning teaching or permitting 'Darwinism' to be taught to receive any funds from the state and would prohibit the paying of state funds to

[1] From the Columbia *State*. The amendment was eliminated from the bill by the conference committee appointed to adjust differences between the bill as passed by the House and by the Senate. It is said that another attempt will probably be made to pass the bill when the legislature meets next year.

any such institution. Senator F. A. Miller of Hartsville is the author of the proviso, which was adopted by the Senate, practically without opposition.

"Ultimate fate of the proviso, which took its place as one of the Senate amendments to which the House refused concurrence, will therefore have to be determined by the conference committee to which the appropriation bill was referred. None of the representatives on this committee from either house have announced their stand on the question and since the House has never explicitly expressed itself on the question the House conferees will consider the proviso without any idea as to the House's stand on the matter.

"The amendment was passed in the Senate practically without debate or opposition, Senator Miller making the only address either for or against the measure. The proviso follows in full:

And provided, further, That no moneys appropriated for public education or for the maintenance and support of state supported institutions shall be used or paid to any such school or institution teaching, or permitting to be taught as a creed to be followed, the cult known as 'Darwinism.'

"The proviso contains no definition of 'Darwinism' and is intended, Senator Miller explains, to apply only to Darwinism and therefore not to the theories of evolution of Lamarck, Bergson, Le Dantec, Baldwin, Osborn, and the many others who have since Darwin's day practically thrown 'Darwinism,' as it was first enunciated, into the discard. The amendment applies, Senator Miller points out, only when 'Darwinism'—which is now defined as the theory of natural selection, that is, the survival of the fittest in the struggle for life, was the mechanism by which evolution was accomplished—is taught or permitted to be taught 'as a creed to be followed' and not when it is merely explained to the pupils as the pagan philosophies are explained."—*Science.*

THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF THE TEACHING OF EVOLUTION[1]

"The mode of origin of species was practically discovered by a little-known German paleontologist by the name of Waagen in 1869, but, like the great discovery of Mendel in heredity, this truth has been long in making its way, even among biologists. Waagen's observations that species do not originate by chance or by accident, as Darwin at one time supposed, but through a continuous and well-

[1] Extracts from articles in the New York *Times* for March 5.

ordered process, has since been confirmed by an overwhelming volume of testimony, so that we are now able to assemble and place in order line after line of animals in their true evolutionary succession, extending, in the case of what I have called the édition de luxe of the horses, over millions of years. We speak to the earth from Eocene times onward to the closing age of man, and it always teaches us exactly the same story. These facts are so well known and make up such an army of evidence, that they form the chief foundation of the statement that evolution has long since passed out of the domain of hypothesis and theory, to which Mr. Bryan refers, into the domain of natural law.

"Evolution takes its place with the gravitation law of Newton. It should be taught in our schools simply as Nature speaks to us about it, and entirely separated from the opinions, materialistic or theistic, which have clustered about it. This simple, direct teaching of Nature is full of moral and spiritual force, if we keep the element of human opinion out of it. The moral principle inherent in evolution is that nothing can be gained in this world without an effort; the ethical principle inherent in evolution is that the best only has the right to survive; the spiritual principle in evolution is the evidence of beauty, of order, and of design in the daily myriad of miracles to which we owe our existence. This is my answer to Mr. Bryan's very natural solicitude about the influence of evolution in our schools and colleges—a solicitude not inherent in the subject itself, but in the foolishness and conceit of certain of the teachers who are privileged to teach of the processes of life.

"It would not be true to say that the evolution of man rests upon evidence as complete as that of the horse, for example, because we have only traced man's ancestors back for a period of 400,000 years, as geologic time was conservatively estimated in 1893 by Secretary Walcott of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington; whereas, we have traced the horse back for a period of 3,000,000 years, according to similar estimates of geologic time.

"The very recent discovery of Tertiary man, which I have just described in *Natural History* (November–December, 1921), living long before the Ice Age, certainly capable of walking in an erect position, having a hand and a foot fashioned like our own, also a brain of sufficient intelligence to fashion many different kinds of implements, to make a fire, to make flint tools which may have been

used for the dressing of hides as clothing, constitutes the most convincing answer to Mr. Bryan's call for more evidence. It once more reminds us of the ignorance of man of the processes of Nature, and sets a new boundary beyond which digging in the earth for more of truth must be directed. This Foxhall man, found near Ipswich, England, thus far known only by the flint implements he made and his fire, is the last bit of evidence in the direction of giving man a descent line of his own far back in geologic time. It tends to remove man still further from the great lines which led to the man apes, the chimpanzee, the orang, the gorilla and the gibbon. This is not guess work, this is a fact. It is another truth which we shall have to accept regardless of its effect. No naturalist has ever ventured to place man so far back in geologic time as this actual discovery of the Foxhall man places him. In this instance again truth is stranger than hypothesis or speculation.

"Nearer to us is the Piltdown man, found not far from 75 miles to the southwest of Ipswich, England; still nearer in geologic time is the Heidelberg man, found on the Neckar River; still nearer is the Neanderthal man, whom we now know all about—his frame, his head form, his industries, his ceremonial burial of the dead, also evidence of his belief in a future existence; nearer still is the Cro-Magnon man, who lived about 30,000 years ago, our equal if not our superior in intelligence. This chain of human ancestors was totally unknown to Darwin. He could not have even dreamed of such a flood of proof and truth. It is a dramatic circumstance that Darwin had within his reach the head of the Neanderthal man without realizing that it constituted the 'missing link' between man and the lower order of creation. All this evidence is today within reach of every schoolboy. It is at the service of Mr. Bryan. It will, we are convinced, satisfactorily answer in the negative his question: 'Is it not more rational to believe in the creation of man by separate act of God than to believe in evolution without a particle of evidence?'"

HENRY FAIRFIELD OSBORN.

"Is it any more degrading to hold that man was made through a long line of animal ancestry than to believe that he was made directly from the dust? Surely the horse and the dog and the monkey belong to higher orders of existence than do the clod and the stone. Whether we accept the teachings of evolution or the most literal interpretation of the Biblical account we are compelled

to recognize the fact that our bodily origin has been a humble one; as Sir Charles Leyell once said, 'It is mud or monkey.' But this lowly origin does not destroy the dignity of man; his real dignity consists not in his origin but in what he is and in what he may become.

"If only the theological opponents of evolution could learn anything from past attempts to confute science by the Bible they would be more cautious. It was once believed universally that the earth was flat and that it was roofed over by a solid 'firmament,' and when scientific evidence was adduced to show that the earth was a sphere and that the 'firmament' was not a solid roof, it was denounced as opposed to the Scriptures. Those who have visited the Columbian Library in the Cathedral of Seville will recall the Bible of Columbus with marginal notes in his own handwriting to prove that the sphericity of the earth was not opposed to the Scriptures, and a treatise written by him while in prison to pacify the Inquisition. Today only Voliva and his followers at Zion City maintain that the earth is flat, and the heavens a solid dome, because this is apparently taught by the Scriptures.

"'The central position of the earth in the universe with all heavenly bodies revolving around it was held to be as certain as holy writ. All the world knows the story of 'Starry Galileo and His Woes' at the hands of the Inquisition, but the Copernican theory was opposed not only by the Roman Catholic Church, but also by the leaders of the Reformation. Martin Luther denounced it as 'the work of a fool;' Melanchthon declared that it was neither honest nor decent to teach this pernicious doctrine, and that it should be repressed by severe measures, and John Wesley declared that it 'tended toward infidelity.' Even as late as 1724 the Newtonian theory of gravity was assailed by eminent authorities as 'atheistic,' since 'it drove God out of His universe and put a law in His place.'

"The conflict between geology and Genesis as to the days of creation and the age of the earth lasted until the middle of the last century, and students of Dana's geology will recall the reconciliation between the two which that great man devoutly undertook. But, by the ultra-orthodox, he and other Christian geologists were denounced as infidels and as impugners of the sacred record. It took three hundred years to end this conflict, if it may be said to be wholly ended now, but certainly no intelligent person now believes

that the earth was made just 5,926 years ago and in six literal days.

"And now comes Mr. Bryan in this twentieth century of enlightenment preaching a new *auto da fé*, attempting to establish an inquisition for the trial of science at the bar of theology! He proposes to prohibit the teaching of evolution by fine and imprisonment, to repeal a law of nature by a law of Kentucky. He proposes to gather into the fold of his narrow theology all existing public and private schools, colleges and universities, and to allow evolutionists and agnostics to found their own schools. In view of the fact that, with the exception of a few sectarian institutions, all our colleges and universities are dedicated to 'the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men,' that for a generation at least they have turned away from the teaching of dogmatic theology to the cultivation of science, literature and art, that they have during this period received great benefactions for the expressed or implied purpose of carrying on this work in the spirit of freedom to seek, to find and to teach the truth as God gives men to see the truth—in view of these considerations it may well be asked whether it would not be more fitting for Mr. Bryan to establish his own institution for teaching his own views of science and theology, as Dowie, for example, did at Zion City, rather than to attempt to convert existing institutions to that purpose.

"Scientific investigators and productive scholars in almost every field have long since accepted evolution in the broadest sense as an established fact. Science now deals with the evolution of the elements, of the stars and solar system, of the earth, of life upon the earth, of various types and species of plants and animals, of the body, mind and society of man, of science, art, government, education and religion. In the light of this great generalization all sciences, and especially those which have to do with living things, have made more progress in the last half century than in all the previous centuries of human history. Even progressive theology has come to regard evolution as an ally rather than as an enemy.

"In the face of all these facts, Mr. Bryan and his kind hurl their medieval theology. It would be amusing if it were not so pathetic and disheartening to see these modern defenders of the faith beating their gongs and firing their giant crackers against the ramparts of science."

EDWIN GRANT CONKLIN.

RECENT EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

THE DEPARTMENT OF SUPERINTENDENCE OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION AT CHICAGO.—" . . . Intelligence tests formed the topic of discussion for the Tuesday evening program, the Department of Superintendence and the National Society for the Study of Education uniting in a joint meeting. Dr. Henry W. Holmes, dean of the Graduate School of Education of Harvard University, speaking on 'The general philosophy of grading and promotion in relation to intelligence-testing,' recorded himself as in favor of the segregation of gifted children in special high school sections, but not in elementary school classes.

" 'Granted that tests of intelligence distinguish satisfactorily between bright and dull pupils,' he said; 'granted that segregation of gifted children is to their advantage; granted that such segregation does not push children beyond their permanent powers of accomplishment; and dismissing the argument against segregation on the ground of 'democracy' or of benefit to the dull by intellectual association with the brilliant, the question remains: Do we want to accomplish by such segregation a saving of time or an enrichment of the education we provide?' He continued:

"This question is in practice a question as to the value of any large administrative scheme which makes rapid advancement the only possibility for classes of gifted children. 'Enrichment' ought to be tried out as an alternative to rapid advancement, for rapid advancement—even if it is possible without nervous strain or physical detriment—breaks normal social groupings and thus tends to emphasize unduly the purely intellectual phases of a child's experience and development.

"Recent study of this problem in Providence, R. I., shows (1) that 'enrichment' is peculiarly difficult in the elementary schools, because we have not enough well-trained and resourceful teachers to handle classes of superior children with an 'enriched' program; (2) that the economic gain in rapid advancement, both to the individual and to the community, is large; (3) that in the high school rapid advancement is less desirable and less feasible than in the elementary school and that enrichment is favored by departmental organization; (4) that a 'pedagogical age' which is approximately the mean between chronological age and mental age marks for superior children a safe limit of advancement; (5) that the advancement into the high school

of gifted children and the segregation of such children in special high-school sections is desirable; (6) but that experiment with 'enrichment' for the gifted in elementary schools is still to be favored, especially in well-to-do communities. . . . "

"The tests are used in helping to locate early those students who lack the ability to complete a normal school course. They are also used in locating the students who can complete the course only by carrying a lighter schedule of studies than the average student and who consequently will have to extend the time for completing the normal school course.

"The tests are used in identifying students who have intellectual ability, but who are failing to achieve results in keeping with their ability.

"The tests provide an objective basis for sectioning together, for purposes of instruction, students of approximately equal mental ability.

"The tests serve as a basis of discussion with parents and with high school principals, in the case of students whose poor records make it advisable or necessary for them to withdraw from school or to extend the time for completing their course.

"The intelligence ratings are made a part of the record of the appointment committee used for guidance in recommendations for positions . . . "

"The edict has gone forth that for all practical purposes it is possible to predict a child's future at the age of twelve. It is 'safe,' in other words, to stamp a twelve-year-old child with the brand of permanent inferiority. It is 'safe' to neglect the broader education of mediocre and dull children, to let them be satisfied with a narrow, specific training that will fit them only for routine work, and to reserve the higher privileges for the 'gifted' children.

"If this is right, the ideal of democracy is wrong; the forces that have resulted in a democratic social order are forces of social involution and not of social evolution; the educational aims and ideals that have gone hand in hand with this social involution, and have been deliberately based upon an assumed possibility of insuring a certain kind of equality among human kind, are a tragic, even a ghastly, mistake.

"The real issue is the need of democracy for a high level of informed intelligence as a basis for collective judgment and collective action. The development of democracy has been unquestionably towards the elevation of the common man to a position of supreme collective control. Our government is a representative government in form; in fact, it is coming ever day closer to a type of direct government controlled by the great masses of the people.

"It cannot now be a question of going back to an earlier form of social control. It is now, as it has never been before, a race between education and annihilation. If education is to save civilization, it must lift the common man to new levels, and not so much to new levels of industrial efficiency as to new levels of thinking and feeling."

W. CARSON RYAN, JR., in *School and Society.*

A NATIONAL POLICY ON ENGINEERING EDUCATION.—"The increasing popularity of the engineering courses has led to steadily increasing enrollments in nearly all colleges. Instructional staffs are overworked and underpaid. To care for this influx there seems to be a tendency to organize certain colleges on what would be called in factory organization a 'quantity production' basis. Large numbers of students are handled according to definite fixed plans, and personal contact is largely lost between instructor and student. A most unfortunate condition exists when an able and inspiring teacher is promoted to the head of a department and becomes so loaded down with administrative details that he does little or no teaching, and loses the opportunity to exert his personal influence on students who should normally receive his instruction. The 'quantity production' idea gives little or no opportunity for character building, which after all is the true basis of success in after life. Where students are handled in quantity the men automatically recite, work up laboratory reports, and pass examinations with very little opportunity for independent thought or action along technical lines.

"Engineers in practice frequently criticise the engineering colleges very harshly for turning out graduates with seemingly inadequate training. Usually these critics have lost their proper perspective or have forgotten just how little they themselves knew of their specialty when they entered college and when they graduated. They

fail to appreciate fully the character of the boy as he enters college, and with whom the teaching staff has to deal.

"It has already been pointed out that the average student entering American engineering colleges is younger and less thoroughly prepared in fundamentals than the Continental students. The American boy has several things in mind when he enters an engineering college; first and foremost, that the training will enable him to earn a better living than if he were without training, and therefore he favors practical courses to pure theory; second, that athletics, fraternity life, and other college activities are almost, if not actually, of equal importance with instructional courses; and third, that his four years in college before entering a cold-blooded business world are going to be the happiest in his life and he must not fail to have a good time during his college career. . . .

"Character-building, tact, initiative, thoroughness, etc., can be developed best in the undergraduate by intimate contact with high grade instructors, and by participation in college activities and athletics under more or less faculty supervision. This may be achieved in the smaller colleges, but unfortunately only a few have adequate laboratory equipment and can afford to secure the best men for their staff. 'Quantity Production' in larger colleges must be replaced by smaller groups of students and larger, less hardworked, and better paid staffs if the best results are to be secured. The adoption of a Common Code of Ethics by all National Engineering Societies and the requirement that every graduate in engineering affirm this code would greatly increase the graduate's sense of responsibility to his profession and would certainly tend to elevate its ethical standards. Thoroughness and accuracy can be developed by problem work and particularly by recitation courses. Personal contact of students with faculty is probably most highly developed under our American student advisory systems. . . .

"If the industries demand highly trained men from the colleges, they must be prepared to make such training worth while. When a request is made to an engineering school for a man, if a degree of Master of Engineering or Doctor of Engineering is demanded and if such men are given preference for positions and are paid somewhat higher salaries than the ordinary graduate, students will soon desire to get the advanced training. Graduate students in engineering

will be few and of mediocre character as a rule until such an attitude prevails on the part of employers.

"The New National Policy on Engineering Education therefore requires greater financial support for the colleges so that an adequate staff of high grade men may be employed and personal contact with students secured through small classes. Greater emphasis must be given in instruction during the four year undergraduate period to fundamental courses, leaving special professional training to graduate years. Certain colleges should be designated as graduate schools and adequate provision made for their proper support both by Government agencies, by private endowment, and by the industries. Scholarships should be provided by the State, by the industries, or by the profession, which will enable eligible undergraduates from all colleges to continue their work in the graduate schools. Finally, employers who desire highly trained technical and research engineers must give first consideration to the men with graduate degrees and must be prepared to reward them financially in proportion to their extra effort and greater expense in educating themselves."

A. G. CHRISTIE, in *Johns Hopkins Alumni Magazine.*

SUBSIDIES FOR ATTENDANCE AT PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY MEETINGS.—"In January of the present year, Swarthmore College took up the question of the payment of expenses incurred by administrative officers and faculty members in attendance upon meetings of professional and learned societies. A committee sent out to 151 colleges and universities on the accepted list of the Association of American Universities a form of inquiry designed to ascertain their practice in this matter. . . .

"To date, 116 replies have been received covering institution of every type located in all sections of the country. . . .

"So far as the administrative officers of colleges and universities are concerned it seems to be the universal practice to pay expenses due to their attendance upon meetings of associations of which the colleges and universities are themselves members. When delegates are sent to represent officially a college or university before a public body, as e.g., a legislature or a legislative committee, or at an inauguration, it is also customary to pay expenses. Finally it is the general practice to pay the expenses of administrative officers who attend sessions of their professional societies. . . .

"In many of the replies received an attempt is made to draw a line sharply between attendance upon official meetings or meetings of associations in which the college or university is itself a member on the one hand, and, on the other hand, meetings of scientific or learned societies in which individuals, usually of faculty rank, are members. To carry out this distinction in practice is admittedly a matter of some difficulty. While virtually all the 116 answers received to the Swarthmore questionnaire indicate payment of expenses in the first of the above cases, only 51 of them, or 44 per cent, show that the institution restricts itself to compensation of this character exclusively.

"Most of the 51 institutions which thus make no provision for the payment of the expenses of faculty members frankly recognize the desirability of so doing and plead poverty as an excuse. . . . It is possible that a few, but certainly a very few, universities make no such provision because they regard the salaries paid as sufficient to enable faculty members to attend meetings of learned societies as frequently as they should. However, no university replying to the questionnaire makes this statement in so many words. . . .

"Fifty colleges answered the inquiry regarding the eligibility of all ranks and grades of the faculty to the benefits accruing from such funds. Thirty-six of these admit faculty members of all grades, the others limiting compensation to heads of departments, full professors, or other ranks down to instructor.

"In fifteen out of thirty colleges answering the inquiry 'who designates individual representatives to attend sessions of learned and professional societies and consequently to receive compensation?' it was stated that this power was in the hands of the president of the college. Most of these answers made it clear, however, that the president consulted deans, heads of departments or professors before making his decision. . . .

"It is not the general practice to make compensation depend upon the reading of papers or participation in discussions at meetings of learned societies. Out of 41 institutions answering this question only eight stated this as a condition. Curiously enough, one of the eight makes it a requirement in the case of instructors but not in the case of faculty members of higher rank. Of the 33 institutions which did not make this requirement, however, fully one-half indi-

cated that preference was given to faculty members who were officers of the associations or who were to read papers or take part in discussions.

"Occasionally in faculty circles opposition is manifested to the compensation plan on the ground that money appropriated for this purpose will be taken out of funds available for salaries. In the last analysis this is almost certain to be the case. It would be deplorable, however, if the compensation plan should be used as an argument against increasing salaries: In practice, the sums received by individual professors as part compensation for expenses are so small that it would be ludicrous to urge them as an offset against salary increase. The very existence of the compensation plan presupposes salaries inadequate to permit sufficient attendance at meetings of learned societies, and is therefore a standing argument for salary increases. Since compensation under this plan nearly always involves an excess expenditure on the part of a professor, it is a little difficult to consider what he receives as a temporary increase in his salary. Even looking at it in this way, however, it would be a salary increase earned and justified by effort on his part to increase his professional efficiency.

"Among all the institutions, replying to the Swarthmore inquiry, Brown University seems to have developed the compensation plan in the most intelligent and promising manner. In his annual report to the Corporation of the University for 1919–20, President W. H. P. Faunce discusses the subject as follows:

In order to promote attendance of the faculty at the annual meetings of learned societies, $500 was appropriated by the corporation to assist in paying the traveling expenses of various professors in attending such meetings during the Christmas holidays. The faculty appointed its own committee to distribute this modest subvention, and through their allotments fifteen professors were aided in attending meetings in which they and their departments of study were vitally concerned. These meetings were held at Ithaca, Cleveland, Ann Arbor, Chicago, St. Louis and Toronto, and the stimulus given and received was of incalculable value. No man can teach today effectively unless he is in personal touch with his colleagues in other institutions, is submitting his own achievements to their scrutiny, and acquainting himself with the latest methods pursued and results attained by other institutions. It is doubtful if any other five hundred dollars expended by the university did so much good as this appropriation for attendance at the annual meetings. . . ."

School and Society.

A BRIEF FOR LATIN AS THE UNIVERSAL SECOND LANGUAGE[1]

1. The rapidly growing need of a universal second language for the uses of statesmen, scientists and business is self-evident.

2. National jealousies will bar the acceptance of any national language for half a century or more. By that time English might grow into acceptance, but the world's need is too urgent for so long a wait.

3. Esperanto is being strongly urged in Europe, especially in Eastern Europe, and is making headway. If a strong movement for Latin is not launched Esperanto may prevail. But, like other artificial languages, it is hard, dry and uninspiring. Moreover, it has no roots in the rich life and literature of the past and therefore no cultural quality. It is cut off by a linguistic fault from the spiritual heritage of mankind.

4. Latin, on the other hand, offers a practical and alluring solution; but the simplest form of Latin that has had acceptance must be chosen if this difficult task of achieving its acceptance is to succeed.

5. Advantages of Latin:

a. For more than a 1000 years Latin was the universal language of lettered Europe, the only universal language the world has had.

b. Most living statesmen, teachers and scientists, and many lawyers and business men have enough basic Latin to learn to use a simple form of the language for writing, reading and speaking.

c. The Roman Church and its schools, spread over the world, used Latin as the language for writing, reading and speaking.

d. Nearly all the secondary schools and colleges of the world have Latin teachers who could easily learn, use and teach a simple form of the language as a living tongue, while, in the case of Esperanto, new teachers would have to be trained and

[1] A meeting of persons interested in the use of Latin as the Auxiliary International Language was held at the Century Club on January fourteenth. The enclosed statement was adopted and I was requested, as secretary of the meeting, to give it as wide publicity and secure as strong co-operation as possible from organizations that would probably be interested.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN P. DUGGAN,
Director of the Institute of International Education.

employed everywhere, the subject would have to be injected into overcrowded curricula, and colleges and universities would have to be persuaded to accept the subject for admission and instruction—changes that decades probably could not effect.

e. Latin is simpler in spelling and pronunciation than English, French or German, and no more complicated in syntax and idiom than French or German.

f. If the United States takes the lead, and teaches Latin as a living tongue in its schools, Great Britain and her dominions, France, Italy, Spain and South America, in all of which Latin is stronger than with us, and probably other countries will follow. And if Latin is taught as a living tongue it will perforce "rise from the dead."

6. Proposals:

a. That this meeting endorse Latin as the universal second language.

b. That this meeting recommend that Latin be taught in the schools and colleges of the United States and of other countries as a living tongue, with a view to its becoming the universal second language.

c. That this meeting authorize a committee from its membership to take appropriate steps to secure for this program the endorsement and aid of competent and influential individuals, societies and association.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH

REPORT OF COMMITTEE R

The Committee on Research offers the following report, in continuation of that published in the March BULLETIN, 1919, p. 11.

Teaching Hours of a Professor in a Graduate School

All graduate schools in the United States, even the strongest, do less than the universities of Europe to extend and intensify the influence of exceptionally great scholars. Pioneer conditions, of course, explain this, but it is a fair question whether some of our institutions are not now strong enough to emulate (for example) French practice. In France the practice is well established not to require a university professor to lecture more than three times a week.[1] Most French university professors have about three days a week to themselves for writing and research.

Considerable time for uninterrupted study every week is necessary in order to permit an able scholar to teach thousands of people by his books and articles in addition to the few that he can reach by his lectures. Some of those responsible for the graduate schools of the United States act as if a graduate professor taught only those whom he met in the class room.

Time for uninterrupted study is also needed for a professor in charge of graduate classes properly to direct the researches of his students. A graduate professor's value and influence is not to be judged by the size of his graduate classes. He may be teaching but half-a-dozen men and yet if these men later become the teachers of thousands, the graduate professor's influence extends in fact to all that multitude of future students.

In the United States, university professors giving courses in a graduate school, and, therefore, supposedly on a par with French

[1] It is hoped that nobody will think that he has disposed of this statement by citing an instance or two of a French professor lecturing more than three times a week. Some French professors extend a lecture to an hour and a half. The professor of Celtic at the University of Paris writes that he is lecturing (voluntarily) eight hours a week. On the other hand a professor in one of the 24 universities in the United States named in this report writes that he is teaching (voluntarily) 24 hours a week. The present report deals with general practice not with exceptions.

professors, are generally expected in our strongest institutions to lecture six or eight times a week. The average for all universities that devote attention to graduate work is around ten hours a week. Few have more than one uninterrupted day in the week for writing and research. It is impossible that our professors should contribute as much to the thought of the world as do scholars beyond the sea with their more generous time-tables.[1]

This is the gist of the information obtained by your committee from (*a*) answers to a questionnaire addressed to the deans of the graduate schools of twenty-four leading universities in the United States, and from (*b*) twelve letters written at our request by European scholars. It is respectfully called to the attention of those responsible for the control of the different universities in the United States.

Our questionnaire was addressed to the graduate schools of twenty-four universities. The list is that of the Association of American Universities for 1920: University of California, Catholic University, University of Chicago, Clark University, Columbia University, Cornell University, Harvard University, University of Illinois, Indiana University, State University of Iowa, Johns Hopkins University, University of Kansas, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of Missouri, University of Nebraska, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, University of Virginia, Stanford University, University of Wisconsin, Yale University.

All of these institutions replied.

These twenty-four graduate schools fall roughly into two divisions:

[1] The following sentence from a letter of gift in which Mr. August Heckscher gave $500,000 to Cornell University in aid of research deserves to be quoted here: "As research in America suffers from the exhaustion of professors by teaching and other duties, it is my desire that professors and instructors possessing the talent and training necessary for research shall, under such conditions and for such periods of time as the University authorities may prescribe, be liberated partially or wholly from those duties and enabled to devote themselves in all the freshness and fullness of their energies to productive investigation and scholarship." Some words with which Acting President A. W. Smith accompanies this letter are: "No teaching can be continuously effective except where the teacher receives the stimulus which comes from the struggle to extend human knowledge. The stimulus may come from the teacher's own research, or from association with others engaged in the work."—*Cornell University President's Report*, 1920–1921, pp. 16, 17.

1. Those in which a professor gives from 6 to 8 lectures per week. A substantial number of the graduate schools reporting belong to this class.

2. Those in which a professor gives from 10 to 12 or more lectures a week.

With some exceptions these two divisions represent two different grades of graduate schools. This may be proved by classifying the various graduate schools either according to their general reputation; or according to their wealth; or according to the number of graduate students resorting to them. If two groups were to be made according to any one of these criteria they would be found to agree pretty well with the groups made on the criterion of the number of hours required of a professor.

To require no more than six to eight hours teaching from a professor in a graduate school is, therefore, already in the United States a mark of first-class practice.

Foreign Universities are Graduate Schools

Letters courteously written by foreign scholars, two of which have been previously published in the Bulletin (May, 1921), indicate that the number of teaching hours of a professor, although somewhat greater in Germany, Scotland and England than in France, is yet less (generally much less) than the average of ten hours expected in the United States. All of the teaching of the foreign professors reporting correspond to that in our graduate schools. (See pages 34 ff.)

Our Professors Teach both in a Graduate School and a College

Of the twenty-four universities reporting it appears that but eleven make a distinction between the time-tables of professors who teach wholly or in part in the graduate school, and those of professors who teach exclusively in the college. Clearly, in the United States few men are engaged exclusively in graduate teaching, and our problem is less how many graduate courses should be the limit, than what is the proper combination of the two types of teaching. One institution reports that its custom is to count one hour of graduate teaching as equivalent to two hours of undergraduate teaching. To meet conditions in the United States some approximate ratio of time allowance for graduate and for college work, perhaps in the pro-

portion of not more than 2 to 1 or less than 1½ to 1 should be established.[1]

In any consideration of teaching hours two other tasks which may rest upon a professor who gives graduate courses ought to be allowed for: first, the necessary duty of supervising doctoral dissertations;[2] second, an often unavoidable burden of administrative cares.[3]

The Difference Between a Graduate School and a College

More than half of the institutions reporting mention no difference between the teaching hours of a professor in the graduate school

[1] A member of the committee writes: "Such a ratio, however, should not be established without an important distinction being made. There is a large group (numerically, if we should embrace all the institutions which attempt graduate work, the largest single group) of what we may term incidental graduate courses. Members of the staff are (1) permitted or (2) encouraged or (3) pushed to offer a graduate course or graduate courses totaling from one to four hours. It often does not essentially differ from a college course, or it may be a rehash of the notes on a graduate course followed by the teacher during his student days, or it may even represent the result of hard serious work during the year it is first given, without the essential background furnished only by continued and continuous reading and study in the subject. Such courses would in an ideal system promptly disappear, but their name will continue legion during my lifetime and yours. To count them as having graduate time value in computing proper schedules would make it the goal of every younger college teacher to get a share in them, and would serve to intensify the course which they already constitute.

So far as I can see, it is hopeless to attempt to define such courses in such a way that they could be with any assurance sifted out from the real graduate courses. I therefore see none but a purely mechanical way to handle the question, perhaps this: taking the hour of undergraduate teaching as the unit, every hour of graduate teaching up to four should count as 1, while every hour above four should count as at least 2. Thus in an institution where 10 hours college work is considered as the norm, an instructor would be considered as measuring up to this had he (1) 4 g + 6 u, or (2) 5 g + 4 u, or (3) 6 g + 2 u, or (4) 7 g. In an institution where 12 is held to be the norm, 8 g would furnish the equivalent of this."

[2] A member of the committee writes: "I should say that as a minimum, every dissertation in my immediate charge costs me fully as much time as the preparation and giving of any hour through the year of teaching work. Some have cost me much more. And at the same time I feel that it is the work in which I have done the most for my students. From the standpoint of the institution, nothing does more to determine the esteem—or the misesteem—accorded to its graduate work by the general academic world than the quality of its doctoral dissertations."

[3] Another member of the committee writes: "Perhaps even more distracting than the hours of teaching is the amount of committee and administrative work forced upon our professors. We have built up in our universities educational machines which threaten to crush us, and to replace scholarship by barren formalism—'credits' not education we set up for attainment by students."

and those of a professor in the college. The difference between a graduate school and a college has not yet been fully grasped in the United States. It is vague in the minds of most governing bodies, and nobody has taken pains to explain it to the general public. People do not remember that in general the universities of Europe correspond to our graduate schools, not to our undergraduate colleges.

It is desirable that a clearer distinction should be drawn between professors in a graduate school, who should first of all devote themselves to research, to publication, and to the directing of a necessarily limited number of advanced students, and college professors whose first duty is to teach large classes of less advanced men and women. That the same men should teach both in a college and in a graduate school is not undesirable. What is undesirable is that because of a popular confusion between the two educational units, professors who direct advanced researches in the United States should be compelled to observe a schedule of teaching hours that was devised for professors in an undergraduate college.

Not only has this confusion tended to keep the hours of teaching in the graduate schools high, it has caused the length of the graduate-school year to be determined by that of the college year. As a result the graduate-school year in the United States is longer than the academic year in most foreign universities.

The graduate school should be organized in another way from the college. In particular the standard of numbers should be wholly different.

The separate and special aims of a graduate school may best be attained by giving its members some opportunity to realize outwardly their corporate existence. Particular buildings might be designated for the use of the school. In many universities a graduate luncheon hall where professors giving graduate instruction and their students could meet daily in informal fashion would stimulate the intellectual life of the graduate school.

Whatever may be the case with a college, it is tolerably clear that no body of laymen is competent to judge the methods by which a graduate school seeks to discover and promulgate new truth. Only the professors actually engaged in research and in directing the studies of advanced students are qualified to tell what the real needs of the school are. The graduate professors, therefore, should control educational questions relating to the graduate school. They

should make recommendations to the president of the university which should determine how the money appropriated for the use of the school should be expended.

Revolving Funds

Nine institutions have something in the way of a revolving fund which can be applied in different years to aid research in different departments. The amount of these funds varies greatly. One university reports that the income of $500,000 is available for this purpose.

Publication

All but three of the twenty-four institutions report that they have given some financial aid during the year to learned journals or monographs.

Nothing, it seems to your committee, is more important for the development of research than (1) to strengthen and enlarge the journals which are devoted to learned articles, and (2) to provide for the publication of learned monographs or books. It is undesirable to increase the number of learned journals. Universities ought preferably to subsidize journals already established.

The present high cost of paper and printing has limited the size of some learned journals and extinguished others. Scholars in many lines are stinted in their means of communication with the learned world. Unless a man can communicate freely his discoveries the incentive to work is largely removed. If the learned journals languish, scholarship tends to sink to the conditions of the dark ages when for lack of prompt and ample means of communication every scholar worked independently, and what he found out often died with him. Learned journals, by affording prompt and ample means of communication, have given modern scholarship its advantage over that of past ages. They have made scholarship a co-operative enterprise, and have enabled every man to build upon the results of others.

The intellectual life of our universities depends upon the dissemination of new ideas by the learned journals. These technical journals are necessarily recondite and hard for the uninitiated to understand, but they are the heart blood of the universities. Through them discoveries and new ideas circulate to vivify and keep alert the whole organization of learning.

A first-class learned journal can no more be expected to support

itself than can a first-class college, art gallery or library. Some have said that scholars ought to pay for their own learned journals. Doubtless, scholars ought to subscribe to technical magazines more widely than at present, but to demand that learned journals be paid for entirely by scholars is nearly as absurd as it would be to demand that grand opera should be paid for by opera singers. In the first place it is impossible; the performers are too few. In the next place it is unjust; because the benefits brought about by the circulation of learned journals are widely distributed. The interchange of ideas by their means gives tone to the universities and energizes the intellectual life of the whole country.

Great as is the need for aid to learned journals, even greater is the present necessity of providing funds for the publication of monographs. Monographs and books which convey valuable ideas, but which are too bulky to be printed in journals, and not sufficiently popular in character to pay their own way, should be printed at the expense of the universities. Special endowments for the publication of useful monographs are needed. Here is a means of doing good to the world which it is hoped may appeal to the imagination of powerful and wealthy friends of learning.

THE COMMITTEE:
E. C. ARMSTRONG
CARL BECKER
C. H. HASKINS
A. R. HOHLFELD[1]
R. G. KENT
E. P. LEWIS
J. L. LOWES
W. A. NITZE
W. A. OLDFATHER
C. C. TORREY
A. C. L. BROWN, *Chairman.*

This is a pioneer attempt to tabulate the teaching hours of professors in our graduate schools. The exigencies of the inquiry have doubtless led to errors. Whoever observes an important error should send a correction to some member of the committee for incorporation in an amended report.

[1] Professor Hohlfeld now in Europe gives permission to attach his signature. He has not seen this report in its final form.

Tabulation of Questionnaire

Name of University	*Hours of a professor teaching undergraduate classes.*	*Hours of a professor[1] teaching solely graduate or both graduate and undergraduate classes.*	*Is there a revolving fund for research.*	*Has the University given aid to publication?*
California	8–12	6–9	Yes	$20,000 in 1920–21
Catholic University	Up to 10	No difference[2]	No	Yes
Chicago	10–15	6–8	No	$35,000 in 1920–21
Clark	Up to 12	2–12	No	Yes
Columbia	6–9	No difference	Yes	Yes
Cornell	8–12	5–9	Yes	Yes
Harvard	6–9	5–9	No	Yes
Illinois	8–12	No difference	Yes	Yes
Indiana	Up to 15	No difference	No	Yes
Iowa	8–15	No difference	Yes	Yes
Johns Hopkins	5–12	No difference	No	Yes
Kansas	10–15	10–12	No	Yes
Michigan	10–12	Average 8.5	No	Yes
Minnesota	8–12	No difference	Yes	Yes
Missouri	9–15	No difference	No	Not in 1920–21
Nebraska	7–15	7–12	No	Yes
Northwestern	10–14	No difference	No	Yes
Ohio State	8–15	No difference	No	Yes
Pennsylvania	12	6–12	No	Not in 1920–21
Princeton	9–12	No difference	No	Yes
Stanford	8–10	No difference	Yes	Yes
Virginia	9–12	No difference	No	Not in 1920–21
Wisconsin	10–15	Average 10	Yes	Yes
Yale	8–10	Average 8.5	Yes	Yes

Letters from Foreign Scholars about Teaching Hours

The absence in the United States of anything approaching a complete separation of the graduate school from the college has led to our expecting as large a number of teaching hours from a professor in a graduate school as from a professor in a college; and it has beclouded our notion of what the duties of a graduate professor ought to be. The following letters which were written by foreign scholars at the request of Committee R may, it is hoped, throw light on conditions

[1] By professor is meant anyone holding a higher rank than instructor. Few professors in the United States teach exclusively graduate classes.

[2] The words "no difference" do not precisely represent actual practice, because older professors who often teach fewer hours than their younger colleagues commonly give a larger proportion of graduate courses.

which prevail in older countries. They are in addition to those published in the *Bulletin* for May, 1921.

ARTHUR C. L. BROWN, *Chairman.*

University of London, University College.
Gower Street, London, W. C. 1
July 8, 1921.

Dear Professor Brown:

It is somewhat difficult to give a useful answer to your query.

My university has made no definite pronouncement on this question as to the number of hours a professor should lecture; and it varies considerably in different subjects. I believe when I was appointed nearly twenty years ago it was agreed informally that the hours of a professor should not exceed seven weekly; of a reader ten; but I think some of my colleagues are appointed on terms which do not require more than three or four. In practice my university work (including a seminar) occupies some six or seven hours weekly. An academic year runs to about thirty weeks divided over three terms. This includes any time devoted to examinations.

This does not, however, settle the question of the number of hours a professor here can devote to his own private work. With the rapid increase of post-graduate research work in London a great deal of my research energy goes to guiding and controlling the work of my students, as well as preparing seminar work and lectures which shall afford that initiation into the method of research which our post-graduate workers require. I do not regard this as lost time from the purely personal point of view; it means indeed necessarily a great deal of research work of my own. At the same time, as things are at present, it is frankly difficult to do much quite independent work during the university terms. Believe me, with kind regards,

Yours very sincerely,
(Signed) J. G. ROBERTSON.

---

12 Regent Terrace, Edinburgh, Scotland.
July 9, 1921.

Dear Sir:

Referring to your letter of June 13th I have to state that I lecture three times a week from October to March, two hours each day. In addition I have one or two tutorials of one hour each—altogether seven or eight hours a week. I can count on Saturday and one other day a week, but this is greatly cut into by university business and correspondence with students, etc. In April, May, June, I lecture three times a week, with one tutorial a week. This gives me more time to myself, but, on the other hand, the preparation for and reading of examinations, etc., makes the summer term perhaps the busiest in the year. Most of my research (when busy e.g. on John Donne) was done on Saturdays and in vacation, i.e. one month to six weeks in spring and two to three months in summer.

Yours truly,
(Signed) H. J. C. GRIERSON,
Professor in the University of Edinburgh.

(Translated from the German by A. C. L. Brown.)

Bonn, July 3, 1921.

Professor Wm. A. Nitze,
University of Chicago.
Dear Sir:

In answer to your inquiry I will say that I give every week six to seven hours of lectures and two hours of seminar teaching. Examinations occupy on an average four hours a week, not including the time devoted to reading examination papers. Faculty meetings occupy two hours a week, not including the half hour spent on the walk each way between my house and the University.

Including Christmas recess we have about five months of vacation.

In general I estimate that I have one forenoon and two afternoons a week (not including Saturdays and Sundays) for my own writing and research. The rest of the time is devoted to the preparation of lectures in which naturally a good deal of scientific investigation is included. For example my *French Etymology* (*Wortbildungslehre*) is the outcome of a course of lectures, and many of my shorter articles have grown out of lectures. On the other hand, my studies in the Basque language (for example) which I hope soon to publish bear no relation to my teaching.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) MEYER-LÜBCKE,
University of Bonn.

Berlin Grünewald,
Warmbrunner Str. 39,
July 18, 1921.

Dear Professor Brown:

In response to your letter of June 7, I am glad to give you the following information gathered from various professors in the University of Berlin who are entirely conversant with the problem in question. (I am not myself, as you seem to think, a professor any more, but am in the American Department of the Foreign Office.) It is entirely impossible to state the case in terms of hours or in any tabular form, because conditions vary thoroughly from case to case; moreover, I must leave it to you to decide how far conclusions and comparisons are permissible with regard to the problem under investigation in the United States, where conditions are so entirely different. Thus, while the facts here presented may not be very tangible they are at least reasonably correct as far as they go.

The German university professor (*ordinarius*) is, as you know, supposed to be an investigator as much as a teacher, and his duties accordingly are so defined that abundant time is left to research work—in theory. In practice to be sure, in the case of many professors, their time is so taken up with other duties as to leave them no time, or at least very little time, for research while the university is in session. In this respect there are very great differences between the different faculties and also between the different chairs within the same faculty, dependent partly upon the contract entered into by the individual incumbent, with the *Kultusministerium*—the terms of which contract are in many cases known only to the two contracting parties—partly to the subject which he teaches.

It seems that the minimum requirement, namely the announcement of one "private" (paid for) course and one public (gratis) weekly lecture per term holds true in not a few cases. As a rule, of course, more courses are given.

In Berlin a full professor (*Professor ordinarius*) in the philosophical faculty lectures eight or nine hours a week. The older professors lecture only six hours. A few professors lecture up to twelve hours a week. There is one case of a mathematician lecturing twenty-two hours. A professor holding a chair in a more remote subject, say Oriental languages, will usually be satisfied with very few hours. The term "announcing" (*Ankündigung*) of one "private course," as used above, means that the actual giving of that course may not ever be required. If not enough students register, or if the professor proves that his state of health is unsatisfactory—which prominent research men or lecturers on remote subjects find very easy to prove—he will not lecture at all.

There is one faculty meeting at 6:00 P.M. each week, usually lasting to about 8,00 P.M. or longer, to which as a rule only full professors are admitted. In these meetings among other things, doctors' theses are finally passed upon, the colloquia of the *Habilitanden* (would-be-*Privatdozenten*) are held, etc. More meetings are held if necessary; toward the end of a term they regularly increase in number. Various committee meetings, the reading and certifying of doctors' theses, and *Habilitationsschriften* take up an additional and considerable part of the professors' time; and so does the reading of the *Seminararbeiten*, especially where the Seminars are large: one whole afternoon is probably the minimum time that should be allowed for one such little thesis or essay.

The Rector and the four Deans have, of course, no time at all for research during the years for which they hold office.

Members of the State Examination Commissions (i.e., for the holding *Oberlehrer*-examinations, etc.) have a very considerable extra burden thrown upon them. But not nearly all of the full professors are such members. This burden has been particularly heavy since the end of the war on account of the many applicants who had interrupted their studies during the war and now come up for examination. All these examinations, as you know, are individual examinations lasting many hours, and they are all held in term time. It is safe to say that the professors taking part in them have no time for research work beyond preparation of their courses.

The time left for research, then, is essentially the vacations. The two terms last from the end of April to the beginning of August (interrupted by about ten days at Whitsuntide) and from the end of October to the beginning of March (interrupted by two weeks at Christmas); so that there are about twenty-one weeks of vacation.

The case is essentially different for the assistant professors, i.e., the *ausserordentliche Professoren* (*extraordinarii*), the American term "assistant professor" does not at all fit. They are less paid and have correspondingly smaller duties. As a rule very few of them can have "*Doktoranden*" or be members of the State Examination Boards as above described, nor do they take part in the faculty meetings. Still lighter are the duties of the titular professors and the *Privatdozenten*, who are not paid by the state at all, and who are held to only one course per term. Even in the few cases where they hold a paid lectureship (*einen*

bezahlten Lehrauftrag) their *Pflichtstundenzahl* is small. With very few exceptions they do not take part, either, in any of the above duties of the regular professors. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that they are obliged to make their living largely outside of the university, since the tuition, or rather lecture fees are entirely insufficient to support them. A forceful movement is now on foot to improve their economic condition.

I am afraid this information is not very adequate nor probably what you expected, but it is probably essentially correct. You are entirely at liberty to publish it in full or in substance over my name.

Yours very sincerely,
(Signed) H. C. DAVIDSON.

Faculté des Lettres,
Bordeaux.
July 6, 1921.

Dear Professor Brown:

I willingly answer the questions in yours of June 13. . . . I lecture three times a week (that is the normal schedule of a French university professor), and can count upon three days a week to myself for research or other private literary work during the session. Our examination work in Bordeaux takes more time than at Rennes (say eight weeks); and that leaves us some fourteen weeks vacation (two at Easter, one at Christmas, included) during which most of us do most of our writing or research.

I have no objection whatever to your publishing or making use of this.

Yours very sincerely,
(Signed) DENIS SAURAT,
Maître de conférences de langue et de littérature anglaises à l'Université de Bordeaux.

---

81 Boulevard Metz,
Rennes, France.
July 6, 1921.

Dear Professor Brown:

I have indeed no objection to your publishing the substance of this letter in your Bulletin, for I should be most happy if I could thus contribute to procure more leisure to American university professors.

In France no university professor (or *Maître de conférences*) is expected to give more than three lectures a week. But the time one can devote to research varies with the departments. In the English department, for instance, our work is more arduous because most of our students go in for competitions such as the *Agrégation* and *Certificat d'Aptitude à l'Enseignement de l'Anglais*, for which a different list of authors to be read (a very long one as a rule) is set every year.

It should also be considered that we have no elementary routine work, our *Facultés des Lettres*, as you know, corresponding to the graduate schools of your universities, rather than to your colleges, so that every one of our lectures has to be prepared carefully, and sometimes contains a good deal of original thinking.

You ask me to tell you the time that I personally am able to devote to research? From what I have said you understand that it is variable. It depends a great

deal upon the author about whom I have to lecture in the course of a year. I may, however, say that on an average I have about two days every week which are entirely my own. I have beside three full months vacation, and this, of course, is the best part of the year for my personal work.

I should say that six weeks of the year are occupied by examinations, during which time I have no strength left for any other work.

On the whole I do not hesitate to say that French professors are much better off than American professors, and I can tell you, after visiting some twenty-five American universities, that I have the deepest admiration for those among you who find time and strength to devote to research when they have twelve and sometimes fourteen teaching hours a week.

Yours very sincerely,

(Signed) A. FEUILLERAT,
University of Rennes.

---

132 Avenue du Maine,
Paris, Aug. 3, 1921.

Dear Sir:

At first sight the question which you ask me is a simple one. Like practically all university professors or lecturers in France I give three lectures a week. Each lecture officially lasts one hour though I am free to extend its duration provided it does not clash with the time-table of the students, and I generally keep them for an hour and a half.

Actual teaching begins the first week in November. There is a ten days' break at Christmas and a fortnight's at Easter. The pressure of examinations is such at the Sorbonne that we have to give up lecturing about the middle of June. The examination period generally lasts for five weeks in summer and three in autumn (starting in Paris about October 15). The actual duration of my long vacation is about ten weeks; it is much less when, as is the case now, I sit on the board of examiners for the "*Agrégation.*"

But the difficulty is to answer your query as to the amount of time I can devote to my own researches. It all depends whether my own work lies in the same lines as my teaching or not. With us a university professor who had to guide and direct his students' work and give them fresh substantial stuff in his lectures (as we all more or less try to do) would have practically no time left for extra study on totally different lines. I know from experience that preparing my next year's course keeps me occupied for the whole vacation, and the job is not done when teaching begins. As the matters set for study in the higher examinations (especially the "*Agrégation*") are changed every year, having charge of such a course means breaking new ground every year. And very few of us keep clear of the "*Agrégation.*" So the only way out is either to rewrite and publish one's courses, or to adapt one's researches to the set programme of the examinations; or to get the programmes adapted to one's preconceived ideas and intentions—which is a matter of influence, personal relationships, scientific standing, etc.; or to trust to luck.

I am, dear sir, yours sincerely,

(Signed) L. CAZAMIAN.
University of Paris.

GRADUATE STUDENTS AND FACULTY RESEARCH.—"So long as graduate students are expected to be immature students in need of a schoolmaster, so long will university professors be schoolmasters and not scholars. When once graduate students are expected to stand on their own feet and take the responsibility for their own education, then university professors may devote themselves to those researches which alone justify their existence. The university has an obligation to the public which is not discharged either by providing an opportunity for continued education or an opportunity for professional training in teaching or in any other art. That is the obligation steadily to maintain research and keep the whole university vitalized by devotion to learning. The question of the graduate school is, therefore, as I see it, whether the maintaining of this devotion shall be left to the efforts of individuals or whether the attempt shall be made to support it by an effective organization. If the latter, then the emphasis in the graduate school falls, not on students, but on subjects. Its business is in no sense to teach the ignorant. Its sole business is the advancement of learning. Its administration and its degrees should be controlled by that end."

DEAN F. J. E. WOODBRIDGE,
in report to the President of Columbia University.

LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

AN EXPERIMENT IN FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN ADMINISTRATION.—"In November, 1921, President John S. Crabbe of Colorado State Teachers' College proposed a plan of faculty participation in formulating and administering the educational policies of the college. . . .

"The faculty organization for carrying out the Greeley plan consists of the faculty council, the standing faculty committees, special faculty committees, the faculty meeting, departmental meetings, and self-surveys.

"The faculty council is made up of the president and the dean of the college as ex-officio members and of five faculty members, one elected by the student council and four by the faculty. The president, who acts as chairman, calls the council into conference for discussion of the broad educational policies of the college. . . .

"The standing faculty committees are selected by a standing committee on committees, which is created in the same way as the faculty council, but with a different elected personnel. The duties of this committee are to determine what faculty committees shall exist, to approve the functions of these committees, to designate the membership of committees, and to promote co-operation among committees.

Committee work is a stated contractual obligation of all members of the faculty, to be undertaken in addition to the regular teaching load. The results of the activities of committees are to be made available to all interested persons and to the faculty in general. . . .

"Faculty meetings at Greeley function 'to unify the faculty, to ascertain discoverable educational programs among the faculty, and to discuss fully and freely local college problems and procedure.' In order to avoid waste of time in extempore speeches on miscellaneous topics, calendar subjects only are considered. 'Current business and significant reports of progress from standing or special committees are always on the calendar.' A regular program for the year's meetings is provided, with typed copies for all faculty members.

"Departmental meetings consider the matters peculiar to their subjects, provide for co-operation with other departments and with related committees, and in particular this year are considering means

of thoroughly professionalizing their subject matter and methods of teaching.

L. W. BOARDMAN, in *School and Society.*

VASSAR: TENURE OF OFFICE.—

The statement as to tenure of office at Vassar in your current issue of the *Bulletin*, while in general accurate, is slightly misleading. The President does not recommend appointment of instructor or assistant, except upon the recommendation of the department concerned. The Faculty Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Dismissals makes formal recommendation on all departmental proposals for officers of higher rank (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor) and no adverse action can be taken by the trustees without offering the opportunity of conference. This is stated in the *Bulletin* as to dismissal, but not as to promotion or appointment.

In the case of calling a full professor to a department lacking such an officer, professors of allied departments are added to the Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Dismissals above named.

A professor in danger of dismissal has the right, not only of appeal but of a hearing, before final action may be taken by the Trustees' Committee.

In the election of a Dean the faculty functions as a department, i.e., passing its recommendation to the Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Dismissals, and thence to the President in consultation.

Yours very truly,
H. N. MACCRACKEN.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY.—A discussion meeting was held in March under the joint auspices of the local Chapter and that of the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education for the consideration of the question "Should our better students be treated as a separate group?" This subject has been for a good while under investigation by a faculty committee, and representatives of different departments reported interesting experiences in the segregation of superior students. In general it has not been thought expedient to segregate at the other end of the scale.

PURDUE.—The Chapter has recently conducted a joint meeting

of members of the Association living in Indiana. Saturday afternoon, March 18, was spent in informal conferences and inspection of the University followed by a dinner and an address by President Denney on the Current Work of the Association. The attendance included representatives from Earlham, Butler, Indiana University and Wabash. Those who could remain over night were entertained. The total attendance at the dinner being more than one hundred. "We feel here at Purdue that this getting acquainted and discussion of problems by the state and non-state colleges in Indiana is going to be of considerable benefit."

MEMBERSHIP

MEMBERS ELECTED

The Committee on Admissions announces the election of forty members, as follows:

Boston University, A. W. Rowe; **Bryn Mawr College,** Susan H. Ballou, J. W. Draper; **University of Idaho,** Anthony Muttkowski; **University of Illinois,** N. A. WESTON; **Iowa State College,** Fredrica V. Shattuck; **Lafayette College,** John Cawley, J. H. De Long, F. O. Dufour, D. A. Hatch, H. T. Spengler; **Northwestern University,** Lew Sarett; **Ohio Wesleyan University,** C. C. Peters, C. E. O'Neal, E. F. Amy, O. K. Boring, A. R. Mead; **Park College,** M. H. Knutsen; **Pennsylvania State College,** W. A. Broyles; **University of Pennsylvania,** C. L. King; **Vassar College,** Harriet L. Ballintine, Violet Barbour, Cora J. Beckwith, Leonora Branch, C. K. Chatterton, Mary B. Cochran, E. H. Geer, Helen T. Gilroy, Miriam C. Gould, Martin Kilpatrick, Anna T. Kitchell, Olive M. Lammert, Mary L. Landon, Ruth-Marie Rogers, Bruno Roselli, Lily R. Taylor; **University of Vermont,** G. F. Eckhard W. E. Aiken; **State College of Washington,** Lelia W. Hunt, A F. Heck.

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following one hundred and twenty-one nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions* and will be considered by the Committee if received before July 1, 1922.

The Committee on Admissions consists of Florence Bascom (Bryn Mawr), Chairman, Edward Capps (Princeton), J. Q. Dealey (Brown), A. R. Hohlfeld (Wisconsin), G. H. Marx (Stanford), and F. C. Woodward (Chicago).

Hamilton F. Allen (Romance Languages), Washington and Jefferson
A. L. Barker (Chemistry), Ripon
J. H. Biles (Physics), Centre

* Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, 222 Charles River Road, Cambridge, Mass.

T. Bruce Birch (Psychology and Education), Wittenberg
John C. Blankenagel (Modern Languages), Franklin
Ethel Bowman (Psychology), Goucher
Eugene F. Bradford (English), Syracuse
Kate Brousseau (Psychology), Mills
A. F. Buddington (Geology), Princeton
Alice C. Bumbaugh (Music), Mills
Frank W. Cady (English), Middlebury
Mollie Ray Carroll (Social Science), Goucher
Jordan Cavan (Education), Butler
Mary Roberts Coolidge (Economics and Sociology), Mills
W. H. Coolidge (Chemistry), Centre
Benjamin D. Cornell (Chemistry), Colorado
Charles Graham Crooks (Mathematics), Centre
Charles E. Cullen (Economics), Washington (St. Louis)
C. W. Cuno (Chemistry), Washington (St. Louis)
George C. Curtiss (English), Rochester
H. M. Dadourian (Physics), Trinity (Conn.)
Eugene Peyton Deatrick (Agriculture), West Virginia
H. Eugene Densford (English), Purdue
C. Henry Dickerman (English), Denison
Max Diez (Modern Languages), Centre
Charles Wright Dodge (Biology), Rochester
Maxwell Jay Dorsey (Horticulture), West Virginia
T. S. Duncan (Greek), Washington (St. Louis)
Henry W. Edgerton (Law), George Washington
Hettie B. Ege (Mathematics), Mills
Ewald Eiserhardt (German), Rochester
Walter E. Ervin (Education), Centre
Floyd C. Fairbanks (Physics), Rochester
B. F. Finkel (Mathematics), Drury
Arthur Sullivan Gale (Mathematics), Rochester
Mary Edith Gamble (Home Economics), Purdue
Ralph John Garber (Agriculture), West Virginia
Nahum James Giddings (Agriculture), West Virginia
Frank D. Graham (Economics), Princeton
Joseph C. Green (History and Politics), Princeton
Raymond D. Havens (English), Rochester
Lucy Lockwood Hazard (English), Mills

John Louis Horn (Education), Mills
Elias Olan James (English), Mills
Vernon L. Kemmerer (Chemistry), Thiel
Ryland M. Kendrick (Greek), Rochester
James E. Kindred (Biology), Western Reserve
Gertrude S. Kingsland (English), Ripon
Carl D. Knight (Electrical Engineering), Worcester
Henry Granger Knight (Agriculture), West Virginia
Julian Moreno-Lacalle (Spanish), Middlebury
Earle Garfield Linsley (Geology), Mills
Annie M. MacNeill (English), Denison
J. H. McKee (English), Purdue
Henry Meier (Modern Languages), Centre
Theodore A. Miller (Classics), Rochester
Owen W. Mills (Biology), Middlebury
John R. Moore (English), Washington (St. Louis)
John R. Murlin (Psychology), Rochester
Elizabeth K. Owen (Economics), Mills
Laurence B. Packard (History), Rochester
Louis A. Pechstein (Psychology and Education), Rochester
Anna B. Peckham (Mathematics), Denison
Harold H. Plough (Biology), Amherst
Byron E. Pontius (Animal Husbandry), Purdue
Burt E. Powell (Political Science), Ohio Wesleyan
A. Cécile Réau (French), Mills
Clarence N. Reynolds, Jr. (Mathematics), West Virginia
O. Edgar Reynolds (Psychology and Education), Rochester
Paul R. Rider (Mathematics), Washington (St. Louis)
J. Philip Schneider (English), Wittenberg
Meta E. Schutz (History), Adelphi
John W. Scott (Zoology), Wyoming
William Berryman Scott (Geology), Princeton
G. H. Shadinger (Chemistry), Butler
C. G. Shatzer (Biology), Wittenberg
Washburne D. Shipton (Geology), Washington (St. Louis)
Everett Skillings (English), Middlebury
Gustavus L. Spillman (German), Louisville
Bird Stair (English), City of New York
Elizabeth R. Stoner (Physical Education), Mills

Millicent Swain (English), Western Reserve
Lauretta V. Sweesy (Music), Mills
Maxy B. Taintor (French), Ripon
Eugene Tavenner (Latin and Greek), Washington (St. Louis)
Marie Agnes Tilson (Education), Purdue
A. N. Topping (Electrical Engineering), Purdue
R. A. Waldron (Biology), Thiel
H. L. Ward (Chemistry), Washington (St. Louis)
C. W. Watkeys (Mathematics), Rochester
Charlie W. Wilson (Zoology), Mills
Boyd A. Wise (Rhetoric), Centre
W. R. Woodmansee (Mathematics), Ripon

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST

Arthur C. Alvarez (Civil Engineering), California
A. C. Baer (Dairy), Agricultural and Mechanical (Oklahoma)
Josephine H. Batchelder (English), Wellesley
Samuel Flagg Bemis (History), Whitman
Mabel Bishop (Biology), Hood
William Hudson Bleakney (Greek), Whitman
William R. Davis (English), Whitman
Robert Ewing Dengler (Classics), Pennsylvania State
Fred C. Domraese (German), Wabash
Eric A. Eckler (English), Pennsylvania State
Walter Crosby Eells (Mathematics), Whitman
Irving Garwood (English), Westminster
Theodore J. Gates (English), Pennsylvania State
Ernest A. Hersam (Metallurgy), California
Frank Lewis Hewitt (English), Dartmouth
Robert Henry Hiller (Greek), Wittenberg
Frank E. Howard (Pedagogy), Middlebury
Laura A. Hubbard (English), Wellesley
H. C. Hubbart (History), Ohio Wesleyan
Hewette Elwell Joyce (English), Dartmouth
Enos Loggan Keezel (Education), Whitman
Zora Klain (German), Pennsylvania State
George Louis Lawrence (Modern Languages), Whitman
David R. Lee (Greek), Tennessee
Elizabeth W. Manwaring (English), Wellesley

Leighton B. Morse (Physics), City of New York
Henry Raymond Mussey (Economics), Wellesley
Alice M. Popper (Modern Languages), Whitman
William Benfield Pressey (English), Dartmouth
Anton Adolph Raven (English), Dartmouth
LeForest Waterman Sawtelle (English), Whitman
Ernest B. Skaggs (Psychology), Ohio Wesleyan
William Kelley Wright (Philosophy), Dartmouth